Exhibit 10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

____________________________)
)
McKIVER, et al)
)
vs.)
)
)
MURPHY-BROWN, LLC, et al)
)
____________________________)

TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 2018
JURY TRIAL

REPORTER'S NOTE:

Since this trial testimony has been provided in rough draft form, please be aware that there will be discrepancies regarding page and line numbers when comparing the rough draft and the final transcript. Also, please be aware that the uncertified rough draft transcript may contain untranslated steno, misspelled proper names, incorrect or missing Q/A symbols or punctuation, and/or nonsensical English word combinations. All such entires will be corrected on the final, certified transcript.

MICHELLE A. McGIRR, RPR, CRR, CRC
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
Raleigh, North Carolina
Stenotype with computer-aided transcription

(Tuesday, April 3, 2018 commencing at 9:15 a.m.)

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Jury in at 9:14 a.m.)

JUDGE BRITT: Good morning, everyone. (All say good morning).

I'm glad to see we have a good array of our citizens who are interested in this case and are in the courtroom. I want to tell all of you that I hope that you will be able to listen and observe this case and gain more of a civic knowledge about the way of our court system while you're doing so. I would point out that one of the most disruptive parts of any court proceeding is when that door back there opens so I would ask your cooperation in minimizing the traffic in and out of the courtroom. In fact, I have instructed the security officers that if a person leaves, they can only return at the next recess, whenever that is. I assure you that the only reason I'm doing that is to try to keep down disruptions as much as I possibly can.

Members of the jury, you got your preliminary instructions yesterday afternoon. You have your notebooks, you're ready to proceed. As you recall me telling you earlier, the first thing that we will have is the opening statements of the lawyers. Mr. Michael Kaeske for the plaintiffs will come before you first and present his opening in the focus groups, reported they smell swine odor inside their homes and outside on their property. Citizens and activists group members who live near large-scale swine operations said odor is a relatively constant nuisance. They said their children cannot go outside and play. Many talk about how they're embarrassed to have visitors because the smell permeates their homes and clothes.

This is just one survey from Smithfield's files of citizens in eastern North Carolina not involved in any lawsuit describing the interference caused by industrial hog operations with their use and enjoyment of their property. Smithfield knows they're interfering with their neighbors' use and enjoyment of the property. The decades of newspaper articles, all the scientific studies, the covers, the alternative technology, they're all addressing the same issue: The odor that comes from open pit lagoons and spray fields. And Smithfield has used no technology, they've done nothing differently since these operations were built to control the odor and to make the neighbors' lives better.

Now, I've told but a bunch of stuff that happened in the last 20 years and shown you a bunch of historical files from Smithfield. Why? Because I expect that you will be instructed that one who employs an independent contractor, the grower, to do work which the employer, Smithfield, knowing or has reason to know to be likely to involve the